

Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, P.L.C.
1300 North 17th Street 11th floor
Arlington VA 22209
703-812-0400 (voice)
703-812-0486 (fax)

MITCHELL LAZARUS
703-812-0440
LAZARUS@FHHLAW.COM

October 23, 2001

Ms. Magalie Salas, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington DC 20554

**Re: ET Docket No. 98-153 -- Revision of Part 15 of the Commission's Rules Regarding
Ultra-Wideband Transmission Systems
*Ex Parte Communication***

Dear Ms. Salas:

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules, on behalf of XtremeSpectrum, Inc., I am filing this letter electronically to report two oral ex parte communications in the above-referenced proceeding.

Yesterday, Martin Rofheart of XtremeSpectrum, Inc., Michele Farquhar, Esq., of Hogan & Hartson, L.L.P., Veronica Haggart, Esq., and I met with Commissioner Michael J. Copps and Paul Margie of his staff and, separately, with Commissioner Kevin J. Martin and Monica Desai of his staff.

At both meetings, we reiterated positions XtremeSpectrum has previously stated in this proceeding, with emphasis on the following points:

- ***Prompt action is needed.*** Prompt Commission action is necessary if consumers and public safety users are to enjoy the benefits of ultra-wideband.
- ***The docket is ripe for decision.*** After three years and well over seven hundred filings, including seven large-scale technical studies, the Commission has the data it needs to reach an informed decision.
- ***All documented interference concerns have been addressed.*** Technical proposals in the docket have fully resolved all interference issues -- including GPS and PCS -- raised by parties that have documented their concerns.

- ***Unnecessarily stringent technical rules will make costs too high for consumers.*** Restricting ultra-wideband to frequencies above 6 GHz would rule out the most commonly used semiconductor technologies, and that in turn would force prices too high for most consumer applications. Reasonable limits on emissions below 3.1 GHz would also add costs, although not unacceptably. But no party has documented *any* interference issues between 3.1 and 6 GHz; and XtremeSpectrum's proposals have resolved all documented issues below 3.1 GHz.
- ***Sound engineering is critical to this proceeding.*** XtremeSpectrum developed its engineering solutions in response to concerns about interference. Although XtremeSpectrum publicly expressed its doubts that some of these measures are necessary, we agreed to abide by them if the Commission so requires. These offers reflect XtremeSpectrum's ability and willingness to tailor its technology -- even at additional expense -- to assure existing users that they will be free of harmful interference. The Commission should not hold back all ultra-wideband proponents in the event some are unable to meet the technical conditions necessary to protect other users.
- ***Regulatory options are desirable.*** To encourage competition and innovation, the Commission should allow manufacturers to choose among two or more regulatory plans, each of which fully protects other users, but each of which accommodates differing ultra-wideband technologies.

If there are any questions about this submission, please call me at the number above.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell Lazarus
Counsel for XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

cc: Meeting participants